

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,754	04/02/2004	Gaston de los Reyes	MCA-636 US	1129
25182 MILLIPORE	7590 01/11/2008 CORPORATION		EXAMINER	
290 CONCOR	RD ROAD		PHASGE, ARUN S	
BILLERICA, MA 01821			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/816,754	DE LOS REYES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Arun S. Phasge	1795				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP	LY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS.				
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tte, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01	November 2007.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 10-21</u> is/are pending in the	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7, 10-21</u> is/are rejected.		•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		·				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority document						
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		•				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•	received in this National Stage				
application from the International Bure	·	traccived				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not	rieceweu.				
Attachment(s)		. •				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

10/816,754

Art Unit: 1795

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deguchi in view of Emery of record for reasons of record.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deguchi in view of Emery as applied to claims above, and further in view of DiMascio et al. (DiMascio), U.S. Patent 6,284,124.

The Deguchi patent does not disclose the modification to the size of the particles as claimed. The DiMascio patent is cited to show the modification to the change in size to provide the desired result (see col. 7, lines 9-50).

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Deguchi patent with the teachings of the DiMascio patent, because the DiMascio patent teaches the selection between the sizes of the particles based upon the desired result.

10/816,754

Art Unit: 1795

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deguchi in view of Emery as applied to claims above, and further in view of Arba et al. (Arba), US 2002/0144954.

The Deguchi reference does not disclose the monolithic framework as claimed, with the channels and inlets defined therein. The Arba reference is cited to show the use of such a framework to produce the benefits obtained by the use thereof (see examples 1 and 2 on page 4).

Consequently, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Deguchi patent with the teachings of the Arba reference, because the Arba reference discloses the benefits obtained by the use of a monolithic framework in an electrodeionization cell.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the combination of Deguchi with Emery is untenable, because the Deguchi reference "suggests that the lateral flow of water is needed to improve contact efficiency."

10/816,754

Art Unit: 1795

The Deguchi reference does not recite a lateral flow, rather the flow of water is obliquely and downward to improve contact efficiency. the oblique flow would not teach away from the presently claimed flow, because the conduits of Emery would provide the flow to the compartments and the oblique flow can continue as disclosed in Deguchi.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-21 are have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is (571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/816,754

Art Unit: 1795

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Arun S. Phasge

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1795